

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 35

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JAMES M. MCCROSSIN, CHARLES V. ROSSI,
and CAROL H. THOMPSON

Appeal No. 2001-0925
Application No. 08/897,401

ON BRIEF

Before HAIRSTON, BARRETT, and FLEMING, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 17 through 36.

The disclosed invention relates to a method and system for transforming image data wherein filters are selectively installed into a filter stack for transforming identified parameters in the image data.

Claim 17 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

17. A method of transforming image data between formats, comprising:

receiving a request for image data in a requested format, the requested format including a plurality of parameters having a first set of parameter values;

identifying a present format for the image data, the present format including a second set of parameter values for the plurality of parameters;

comparing the second set of parameter values to the first set of parameter values;

responsive to identifying at least one parameter value within the second set which does not match a parameter value within the first set for a corresponding parameter, initializing a filter stack capable of containing an arbitrary number of selectively installed filters;

for each parameter value within the second set which does not match a corresponding parameter value within the first set, installing a filter in the filter stack for altering the image data; and

applying each filter in the filter stack to the image data, wherein the image data may be efficiently transformed from the present format to the requested format.

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Baroody, Jr. (Baroody)	4,703,515	Oct. 27, 1987
Keith et al. (Keith)	4,785,349	Nov. 15, 1988
Le Gall et al. (Le Gall)	4,897,799	Jan. 30, 1990
Parulski et al. (Parulski)	5,040,068	Aug. 13, 1991
Calarco et al. (Calarco)	5,237,432	Aug. 17, 1993

Foley et al. (Foley), Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice, pp. 585-87 (2ND Ed., 1990).

Appeal No. 2001-0925
Application No. 08/897,401

Claims 17, 19, 21 through 25, 27 and 29 through 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Le Gall in view of Baroody.

Claims 18 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Le Gall in view of Baroody and Foley.

Claims 18 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Le Gall in view of Baroody and Parulski.

Claims 20, 28 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Le Gall in view of Baroody, Parulski, Keith and Calarco.

Reference is made to the briefs (paper numbers 31 and 33) and the answer (paper number 32) for the respective positions of the appellants and the examiner.

OPINION

We have carefully considered the entire record before us, and we will sustain the obviousness rejection of claims 17, 21 through 25 and 29 through 35, and reverse the obviousness rejection of claims 18 through 20, 26 through 28 and 36.

We agree with the examiner's findings (answer, page 4) concerning the teachings of Le Gall. Le Gall discloses a method and system for transforming image data between formats used at the originating device 12, 100 and the receiving unit 15,

200 (Figures 1 and 4). A request of some type starts the image transformation process by letting the originating device know that the receiving device seeks image data that it can use in its local format. The receiving device has image data in a second raster format or "requested format," and the originating device has image data in a first raster format or "present format." The requested format 200 and the present format 100 include first and second sets of parameter values, respectively (Figure 4). Le Gall uses a universal conversion unit that includes a group of algorithms/filters for converting data from one raster format out of a multiplicity of possible raster formats to another raster format out of the multiplicity of possible raster formats (Figure 1; column 6, lines 49 through 53). In the universal conversion unit, Le Gall compares a plurality of predetermined characteristics/second parameter values of the first raster format with information explicitly identifying a plurality of predetermined characteristics/first parameters values of the second raster format (column 6, lines 54 through 60). Based upon the comparison, the universal conversion unit selects a subset of algorithms/filters from the group/library of algorithms/filters (column 6, lines 61 and 62). The selected subset of algorithms/filters is comprised of a subset of algorithms/filters

from the group/library of algorithms that is necessary to convert the raster image data in the first raster format to the second raster format (column 6, lines 62 through 66). The raster image data in the first raster format is thereafter processed in the universal conversion unit with the selected subset of algorithms/filters so that the raster image data in the first raster format is converted to the second raster format (column 6, line 67 through column 7, line 2). Thus, Le Gall initializes and installs an algorithm/filter stack of selectively installed algorithms/filters in response to the comparison output, and applies each algorithm/filter in the algorithm/filter stack "to the image data, wherein the image data may be efficiently transformed from the present format to the requested format" as required by the steps of claim 17.

Based upon the foregoing, it is seen that Le Gall does not teach "a fixed series of filters in a persistent configuration" (brief, page 9). Instead, Le Gall teaches that the filters may be "selectively installed or added only as needed" to the filter stack "at run time" (brief, pages 9 and 10; reply brief, page 4). Accordingly, we will sustain the obviousness rejection of claim

17 based on the sole teachings of Le Gall.¹ In sustaining a multiple reference rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Board may rely on one reference alone without designating it as a new ground of rejection. In re Bush, 296 F.2d 491, 496, 131 USPQ 263, 266-67 (CCPA 1961); In re Boyer, 363 F.2d 455, 458 n.2, 150 USPQ 441, 444 n.2 (CCPA 1966). The obviousness rejection of claims 23 through 25 and 31 through 33 is likewise sustained because appellants have not presented any patentability arguments for these claims.

The obviousness rejection of claims 21, 29 and 34 is sustained because Le Gall teaches "installing only necessary filters from a comprehensive filter library within a filter stack" (brief, page 12). The obviousness rejection of claims 22, 30 and 35 is sustained because Le Gall teaches "serially connecting filters within a filter stack" (brief, page 13).

The obviousness rejection of claims 18 and 26 is reversed because the examiner's reasoning (answer, pages 6 through 8) falls far short of a convincing line of reasoning for modifying the implicit request in Le Gall to correspond to the specifically recited request in the claims on appeal.

¹ The teachings of Barody are merely cumulative to those already found in Le Gall.

Appeal No. 2001-0925
Application No. 08/897,401

The obviousness rejection of claims 19 and 27 is reversed because we agree with the appellants' argument (brief, page 11) that "[n]one of the cited references teach or suggest reading image data into a buffer before applying filters "

The obviousness rejection of claims 20, 28 and 36 is reversed because the examiner's reasoning (answer, pages 8 through 10) falls far short of a convincing line of reasoning for modifying the filter library disclosed by Le Gall to correspond to the specifically recited filter library in the claims on appeal.

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 17 through 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is affirmed as to claims 17, 21 through 25 and 29 through 35, and is reversed as to claims 18 through 20, 26 through 28 and 36. Accordingly, the decision of the examiner is affirmed-in-part.

Appeal No. 2001-0925
Application No. 08/897,401

No time period for taking any subsequent action in
connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR
§ 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED-IN-PART

)	
KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
LEE E. BARRETT)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
MICHAEL R. FLEMING)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

KWH:hh

Appeal No. 2001-0925
Application No. 08/897,401

ANDREW J. DILLON
FELSMAN, BRADLEY, GUNTER & DILLON, L.L.P.
STE. 350, LAKEWOOD ON THE PARK
6700B NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY
AUSTIN, TX 78731